DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 097 HE 004 515

AUTHOR	Freeman, Thomas M.; Rossmeier, Joseph G.
TITLE	A New Look at Tenure: A Management Imperative.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	10 May 73
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Educational Administration; Educational Research; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; Management; *Teacher Welfare; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

This study examines several tenure trends, their relation to other current issues in nigher education, the problem of supporting tenure trends in the future, and several solutions to resolve the current tenure crisis including another viable basis for analyzing tenure data. Some of the more reliable position indicators of tenure trends are faculty-by-rank distribution, potential faculty eligible for tenure and actual tenured faculty rates. These trends indicate that the number of tenured faculty is increasing at a rate of .5 to .7 percent per year. In reviewing tenure policies, institutions must be able to deal with future program shifts, demands of collective bargaining, federal and state financial cutbacks, and normal higher costs to retain tenured faculty. Several solutions applied to problems stemming from too many tenured faculty include quotas, equalized rank distribution, early retirement benefits, term contracts, more temporary appointments, appointment of new faculty only to lower ranks, and general slowdown of rate of promotion. Another alternative for resolving the tenure problem involves the concept of flexible dollars. These are dollars not committed because of tenure, job security, or other relatively fixed forms of financial obligations. In analyzing institutional situations, tenure commitment calculations are based on dollars rather than on positions. Normally 10 to 15 percent must be added to an institution's tenured personnel percentage figure to obtain actual dollar commitment. (Author)

ED 080097

ABSTRACT

A NEW LOOK AT TENURE: A Management Imperative

by Thomas M. Freeman, Associate Director
and Joseph G. Rossmeier, Instructor
Office of Institutional Research
Michigan State University

May 10, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This study examines several tenure trends, their relation to other current issues in higher education, the problem of supporting tenure trends in the future, and several solutions to resolve the current tenure crisis including another viable basis for analyzing tenure data. Some of the more reliable position indicators of tenure trends are faculty-by-rank distribution, potential faculty eligible for tenure and actual tenured faculty rates. These trends indicate that the number of tenured faculty is increasing at a rate of .5 to .7 percent per year.

In reviewing tenure policies, institutions must be able to deal with future program shifts, demands of collective bargaining, federal and state financial cutbacks, and normal higher costs to retain tenure faculty. Several solutions applied to problems stemming from too many tenured faculty include quotas, equalized rank distribution, early retirement benefits, term contracts, more temporary appointments, appointments of new faculty only to lower ranks, and general slowdown of rate of promotion.

Another alternative for resolving the tenure problem involves the concept of flexible dollars. These are dollars not committed because of tenure, job security, or other relatively fixed forms of financial obligations. In analyzing institutional situations, tenure commitment calculations are based on dollars rather than on positions. Normally 10 to 15 percent must be added to an institution's tenure personnel percentage figure to obtain actual dollar commitment. The percentage of positions is too high when actual dollars to support committed tenured faculty hinders institutions in coping with other financial constraints.

HE 004 515

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

May 10, 1973

A NEW LOOK AT TENURE: A Management Imperative

by Thomas M. Freeman, Associate Director
and Joseph G. Rossmeier, Instructor
Office of Institutional Research
Michigan State University

Tenure, a term that suggests both sinecure and academic freedom, continues to undergo scrutiny under the auspices of much publicity. In recent months almost every professional periodical on higher education has devoted at least one article to the subject of tenure. The New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and countless lesser known newspapers are also carrying articles about the debate. There is also the proliferation of such books as The Tenure Debate, Tenure, Aspects of Job Security on the Changing Campus, and Tenure in American Higher Education that are devoted entirely to the issue of tenure. On the local level many institutions (e.g., University of Utah, Wisconsin, Michigan State University, etc.) have spent innumerable faculty and staff man-hours on committees studying the nature of tenure. On the national scale the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, sponsored by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges, has just concluded a two-year study. Predictably, along with a few subtleties graced by conventional laments about the abuses of tenure, most analysts continue to wave the American flag with both hands while arguing for the survival of tenure with a few reforms, of course, on the ground that it is a necessary undergirding of academic freedom.

Since the term tenure has already undergone its share of transplants, biopsies and, in some cases, even autopsies, this analysis shall refrain from further attempting to justify the existence of tenure. Instead, we

will look first at several tenure trends in American higher education and, second, at several broader issues in higher education which have the potential for affecting tenure. We will pose numerous questions as to whether current tenure trends can be supported in the future. Third, several solutions resolving the current tenure crisis are offered, including a proposed new basis for analyzing tenure data.

CURRENT TENURE TRENDS

The first question posed concerns whether rank distribution and tenure are currently at a dangerous level. For this analysis a "dangerous level" is defined as a situation where fixed commitments of institutional staff resources have created inflexibility with program change difficult and perhaps nonexistent. The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (1973) recently stated that higher education is, in academic jargon, "tenured in;" others in recent months have called the current crisis the "tenure squeeze." In a very general sense, the Commission's report concludes that about half of the half-million faculty hold tenure, with tenured faculty ranging from 25 percent at some institutions to 80 percent at others, with most institutions tending toward the latter situation.

Probably some of the more reliable position indicators of tenure trends are faculty-by-rank distribution, potential faculty eligible for tenure, and actual tenured faculty rates. Tenure is not always related in direct proportion to rank, therefore the percentages of faculty holding the rank of associate or, on occasion, the rank of full professor is not necessarily indicative of the actual percentage of faculty holding tenure. Three procedural circumstances are the cause of these discrepancies. First, some institutions award tenure to instructors and assistant professors upon reappointment after the successful completion of a probationary or term period. Second, some

institutions issue appointments to the top two ranks on a probationary or term basis rather than give automatic tenure. Third, the base for the computation of the percentage of faculty on tenure varies considerably among institutions.[1]

Rank Distribution

Aside from these cautionary limitations one can estimate, with a certain degree of accuracy, trends about tenure by looking at the rank distribution. For example, Table One indicates the percentage of faculty members at the four basic ranks in land-grant colleges and state universities for the years 1951-52, 1961-62, and 1971-72.[2] From these data one can conclude that as the rank distribution of faculty moves from instructor to professor, more faculty become tenured. Furthermore, one can assume, that since the percent of professors has increased by 6.5 percent, the number of tenured faculty has probably increased at least an equal factor.

---

[1]For example, a dichotomy exists between persons assigned to instructional tasks versus those assigned to administrative or non-instructional duties. Confusion also exists between full-time--part-time, FTEF--headcount, regular faculty--visiting faculty or acting faculty, temporary--continuous, paid--nonpaid, and the dichotomous choices go on. All these alternatives are possible within the four ranks and do not include assistant instructor, lecturer, research associate, specialist, librarians, or counselors, etc., who often are also members of the instructional staff.

[2]Note that institutions involved in these three years are different in number and slightly different in character. State universities play a more significant role in the second and third data accumulations than in the first.

TABLE 1: Percent of Faculty Members at Four Basic Ranks in Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 1951-52, 1961-62, 1971-72

Rank	1951-52[a]	1961-62[b]	1971-72[c]
Professor	26.7	27.8	33.2
	)47.7	)52.1	)58.2
Assoc. Professor	21.0	24.3	25.0
Ass't Professor	28.7	28.4	30.8
	)52.4	)47.9	)41.8
Instructor	23.7	19.5	11.0
	100.1	100.0	100.0

---

a) 68 Land-Grant Colleges
20 State Universities
Data from Faculty Salaries in Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Circular No. 358, 1951-52.

b) 57 Land-Grant Colleges
82 State Universities
Data from Salaries Paid and Salary Practices in Universities & Colleges, 1961-62. Higher Education Series, Research Report 1962-R2, Research Division, National Education Association, February, 1962.

c) 57 Land-Grant Colleges
40 State Universities which includes numerous state university systems such as Wisconsin, CUNY, and California, etc. Faculty data were taken from the "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1971-72," AAUP Bulletin, 58 (2) Summer, 1972, pp. 201-233.

* * *

The trends which show the rank distributions of state universities and land-grant colleges differ somewhat from distributions of a more heterogeneous group of institutions. For example, Trow (1973), in his large national survey of faculty in a random sample of over 300 institutions in 1969, found the following rank distribution:

Professor	25.4%	)49.4%
Assoc. Professor	24.0%	
Ass't Professor	30.5%	)50.6%
Instructor	20.1%	

Evidently, the more graduate-oriented the sample of institutions, the

more likely the upper ranks will hold a higher proportion of the tenured faculty. This inference is strongly supported by figures in Table Two, which exhibits the rank distributions of 1,244 institutions listed in the AAUP annual survey, the rank distribution of 130 graduate institutions included in the recent ACE study (Roose and Andersen, 1970), and the rank distribution of the Big Ten, all for 1971-72. The Big Ten, comprised of institutions which are highly graduate program oriented, have the highest percentage of upper-ranked faculty.

TABLE 2: Comparisons of Faculty Rank Distribution for 1971-72*

Rank	1,244 Instit. of AAUP		130 ACE[a]		Big Ten	
Professor	25.3%	)49.8%	33.4%	)58.6%	36.4%	)60.8%
Assoc. Professor	24.5		25.1		24.4	
Ass't Professor	35.6	)50.2	31.1	41.4	27.9	)39.2
Instructor	14.6		10.4		11.3	
	100.0		100.0		100.0	

*Source: "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1971-72." AAUP Bulletin, 58 (2), Summer, 1972, pp. 201-233.

[a]Lawrence Institute of Paper Technology, Peabody College, and the University of Delaware, are not included. Figures include the entire University of Wisconsin and University of California Systems.

* * *

Faculty Eligible for Tenure

The trend of tenured faculty is also directly affected by the number of faculty eligible for tenure, i.e., in the tenure stream.[3] A current

[3]Eligible for tenure includes both tenured and non-tenured faculty.

OIR tenure study at Michigan State University[4] shows that of 62 universities who responded, faculty eligible for tenure in the four ranks increased 5.1 percent between 1970-71 and 1972-73, as shown in Table Three.

Furniss (1972) found that of the 413 institutions he surveyed, 33.3 percent award tenure to instructors and 85.2 percent award tenure to assistant professors. Shaw (1971) determined in his study of 80 state universities and land-grant colleges that 46.3 percent offered tenure to assistant professors and 27.5 percent offered tenure to instructors. Awarding tenure to the lower ranks is not necessarily a recent phenomenon, for Pfinster (1957) learned in his study of 128 colleges that 34.4 percent award tenure to assistant professors and 44.5 percent to instructors.

Faculty Tenure Rates

Actual faculty tenure rates are still the best indicator of tenure trends. Previous research also shows that in most institutions about half the faculty hold tenure appointments; however, the range of variation is quite extensive. Shaw (1971) found that 52.2 percent of ranked and all other instructional faculty in 60 state universities and land-grant colleges were tenured. Furniss (1972) concluded that over 50 percent of all instructional faculty are tenured at 46.1 percent of the public universities, 61.3 percent of the private universities, 34.2 percent of the private four-year colleges, and 37.1 percent of the public four-year colleges, and 43.1 percent of all 413 institutions which responded.

The current OIR tenure study of 62 graduate institutions as shown in Table Three found that the number of tenured faculty increased by 9.7 per-

---

[4]In early January, 1972, tenure information w as requested from the 130 graduate institutions included in the publication by Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Andersen, A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington: ACE, 1970. Usable information was received from 62 universities.

cent between 1970-71 and 1972-73. The number of tenured faculty increased slightly less than twice as fast as the number of faculty eligible for tenure and about a third faster than the number of all ranked instructional faculty over the same two-year period. Table Three also shows that over the two-year period, in the upper two ranks, the number of ranked instructional personnel increased by 10.3 percent, the number of faculty eligible for tenure increased by 9.2 percent and the number of tenured faculty increased by 10.6 percent. These figures indicate that faculty in the upper two ranks has increased approximately 10 percent for all three categories (ranked instructional faculty, faculty eligible for tenure, and tenured faculty) during the last two years.

Trow (1973) stated in his 1969 study of 27,191 faculty that tenured faculty were 51.0 percent of all ranked instructional faculty (includes ranked temporary faculty); 52.6 percent of ranked instructional faculty eligible for tenure; and 49.9 percent of total instructional personnel (ranked and non-ranked, including lecturers, assistant instructors, research associates, and specialists). Compared with Trow, the current OIR study, as shown in Table Four, found that for 1970 tenured faculty were 55.1 percent of all ranked instructional faculty (includes ranked temporary faculty); 59.8 percent of all instructional faculty eligible for tenure; and 46.1 percent of all instructional personnel (ranked and non-ranked). For 1972, tenured faculty were 56.6 percent of all ranked instructional faculty, 62.3 percent of all ranked instructional faculty eligible for tenure; and 47.2 percent of all ranked and non-ranked instructional personnel.

The percentage differences between comparable categories of the Trow study and the current OIR study are attributed partly to the institutions included in each sample. Trow's study concerned faculty from a cross section

TABLE 3: Comparison of Tenured Faculty by Rank Distribution for 62 Graduate Universities 1970-1971, 1972-1973.

1970--1971

	I Instructional Faculty[a] N=55,208 %	II Faculty Eligible for Tenure N=50,847 %	III Tenured Faculty N=30,420 %
Professor	29.6	30.6	50.9
	)54.6	)56.2	)86.9
Assoc. Professor	25.0	25.6	36.0
Ass't Professor	31.4	32.4	10.8
	)45.4	)43.8	)13.1
Instructor	14.0	11.4	2.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0

1972--1973

	I N=58,967 %	II N=53,542 %	III N=33,375 %
Professor	30.6	32.0	51.3
	)56.4	)58.3	)87.6
Assoc. Professor	25.8	26.3	36.3
Ass't Professor	31.6	32.1	9.8
	)43.6	)41.7	)12.4
Instructor	12.0	9.6	2.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0

	I	II	III
Percent of Two-Year Increase for all Ranks	(3759) +6.7%	(2695) +5.1%	(2955) +9.7%
	I	II	III
Percent of Two-Year Increase in Upper Two Ranks	(3113) +10.3%	(2639) +9.2%	(2801) +10.6%

[a]Included are temporary ranked faculty with pay.

TABLE 4: Percentage of Tenured Faculty at 62 Graduate Institutions Depending on Computation Base.

	Total Instructional Personnel[a]	Total Instructional Personnel[a] Who Are Tenured	% of Ranked Instructional Faculty Who Are Tenured	% of Faculty Eligible for Tenure Who Are Tenured
1972	70,693	47.2	56.6	62.3
1970	66,010	46.1	55.1	59.8

[a]Includes assistant instructors, lecturers, research associates, specialists, in addition to all ranked instructional personnel.

* * *

of higher education while the MSU study focused only on graduate institutions. Nevertheless, both studies indicate substantial differences depending on computation base to calculate the percentage of tenured faculty. The evidence also indicates here that tenure percentages are increasing steadily regardless of which computation base is used.

Even though the MSU study has derived its trend data on two years which are relatively close, one can assume that these trends tend to provide an overall picture of the tenure situation. From the trends shown in the current research and pointed out in previous research, the number of tenured faculty is increasing at a rate (.5 to .7 percent per year) which could easily lead to disastrous consequences in forthcoming years.

CURRENT NATIONAL ISSUES AFFECTING TENURE

In view of the current tenure trend, what are some of the current national issues which make a review of current tenure personnel policies necessary? First, the end of the military draft, higher fees and tuitions, and a phenomenon called "stopping out" by the Carnegie Commission are causing

a dramatic slowdown in enrollment growth at the nation's colleges and universities. The 10 percent growth rates of the 1960s have suddenly shifted to a more normal 2-3 percent level, and probably will remain at the lower rate through the 1980s.

Second, coupled with unparalleled enrollment growth during the 1960s was the growth of institutional budgets. Now, in a time of general financial exigency, many institutions are finding themselves in a non-flexible predicament. Cheit, in his recent book, The New Depression in Higher Education-Two Years Later, claims that the 41 institutions he examined in 1970 have since then "achieved a stabilized financial situation and have gone from a financial condition of steady erosion to one of fragile stability." The stabilized financial situation has been accomplished primarily through extraordinary cuts in expenditures that clearly cannot go on indefinitely. On the other hand, in the past year legislators, as well as administrators, have found that budget reductions, program cutbacks or re-allocations became next to impossible because of tenured faculty.

Third, severe pressures are being exerted on colleges and universities for increased accountability to a variety of agencies and interests including the general public, legislators, governmental agencies, the courts, coordinating and governing boards, faculty, students, and other internal constituents. Mortimer (1972) cites three applications of the term "accountability in higher education:" managerial accountability, accountability versus evaluation, and accountability versus responsibility. All three applications are relevant to the proportion of tenured faculty in an institution.

Related also to the three dimensions of accountability is the trend

toward collective bargaining.[5] Will faculty bargaining units begin trading off concepts of academic freedom and tenure for pay increases or reduction in work loads? Or will tenure be bolstered as guaranteed security through collective bargaining?

The fourth issue concerns longevity of current tenured faculty. Miller (1970) claims that the average tenured position extends over a 35-year period, while the average nontenured faculty member stays only for seven years. Consequently, an institution has the choice between one tenured position or 10 nontenured positions over a 35-year period. Keast (1973) and Trow (1973) both claim that within the last few years about 75 percent of all faculty members were under 50 years old, and nearly two-thirds of tenured faculty were under 50. A lower average age distribution will result in fewer retirements for the next ten years.

Closely related to tenured faculty longevity is the issue of over-supply. Faced with a surplus faculty and a scarcity of available positions, institutions are experiencing a decreasing turnover rate because employed faculty are constrained by considerably lessened mobility.

These issues, when placed in the concept of a no-growth faculty situation, exacerbate the movement towards restricting tenure. Certainly such conditions as declining rates of enrollment growth, dwindling financial resources, program reorganization, and fixed or reduced staffs should cause institutions to re-examine the current state of tenure affairs.

---

[5] As of January, 1973, there were bargaining units involving faculties at about 250 (or 8.9%) of 2,800 colleges and universities in the United States. An estimated 75,000 faculty members were covered by these units. The New York Times of April 22, 1973, reporting on a forthcoming book (Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education).

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-EXAMINATION

National trend statistics are not as critical as individual institutional situations. In reviewing your own situation related to tenure levels consider the following questions. Assuming current personnel practices regarding tenure will continue unchanged, will your institution be able to deal with the following program factors:

- . future program shifts and new program development,
- . normal salary demands of faculty and staff,
- . extra demands of collective bargaining,
- . inflation and cost of living increases,
- . cutbacks in federal and state funds,
- . reversal of out-of-state tuition clause,
- . higher cost to retain tenure faculty (assuming that the average salary of a nontenured faculty is about half that of a tenured faculty member)?

In addition to determining an institutional tenure rate and rank distribution, each institution must determine relative tenure rate and rank distribution for each college and department since percentages are not likely to be uniform throughout an institution. In fact, the situation is compounded if high tenure levels were found in declining programs, a not unlikely situation.

SOLUTIONS TO HIGH TENURE RATES

Up to now, most institutions have not formally instituted any restrictions on the number or percentage of tenured faculty. In the OIR study of 130 graduate institutions, 13.4 percent of 82 institutions who responded indicated they were considering imposing a quota limiting tenure appointments. Furniss (1972) found that only 5.9 percent of 413 institutions (all types) were

actually limiting the percentage of tenured faculty as of January, 1972.

Solutions applied elsewhere to the problems stemming from too many tenured faculty include tenure quotas, equalized rank distribution, early retirement benefits, term contracts as opposed to a tenure system, more temporary appointments, appointments of new faculty only to lower ranks, and a general slowdown of the rate of promotion. Of the procedures proposed for dealing with fixed commitment or tenure levels, some results are evident:

a) Utilization of a package of benefits for early retirement does not provide cost savings to the institution but is appropriate for improving the distribution of faculty age or rank.

b) Appointment at a lower rank (instructor versus assistant professor) and increased time between promotions is effective in helping to sustain tenure levels or to reduce them, depending upon its method and rate of application.

c) Stanford University (Hopkins, 1972) found, that if one of its colleges made no additions to tenure while hiring new personnel and allowing for terminations, the tenure proportion would drop from 71 percent back to 57 percent in a ten-year period. Michigan State University would experience a similar kind of result.

d) Term contracts in lieu of tenure have not met with overwhelming favor by those studying tenure and alternative systems.

One key recommendation of the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (1973) is to extend the probationary period to at least five years before tenure can be granted. Currently more than one-fourth of all institutions

have less than five-year probationary terms according to Furniss (1972). The Commission also recommended that tenure quotas be expressed and utilized as "ranges or limits rather than as fixed percentages."

Concept of Flexible Dollars

Probably more important than any of the mechanisms and procedures just given is the need for institutions to consider those factors pertinent to the establishment of what Furniss (1973) calls "steady-state" planning, that is, planning when an institution has stopped expanding, especially in enrollments. The suggestion is made here that tenure percentages of committed positions, however computed, are not the critical factor in analyzing institutional situations. Rather, tenure commitment calculations should be based on dollars rather than on positions. Table Five shows, that in a hypothetical situation where positions are converted to dollars, a different picture becomes evident between dollar tenure commitment as opposed to position tenure commitment because faculty in upper ranks consume more dollars per position than lower ranks. On the dollar basis 64.60 percent of the total instructional costs is committed to tenured faculty. On the position basis 55.00 percent of the total instructional faculty is committed to tenured faculty. This illustrates the point that unless one translates obligations (tenure, tenure eligible, and job security) into dollars the appearances of low-tenured personnel percentages can be dangerously misleading.

Derived from these comparisons, is the concept of flexible dollars which is posed here as a better guide for management and planning in a steady-state situation. Flexible dollars are those dollars that are not committed because of tenure, job security, or the relatively fixed forms of financial obligations. Flexible dollars are dollars (or faculty) needed to accommodate student enrollment shifts among colleges and departments.

It is important for an institution to retain in each budget a sufficient amount of uncommitted dollars for nontenured and nontenured-but-eligible faculty, so that positions and resources can be shifted to accommodate growth areas or provide for new academic programs. This involves applying a university SCH/FTEF average to all colleges and departments and then asking how many staff (FTEF) should be shifted (added or subtracted) from each college to meet instructional need. The shifts in faculty (FTEF) can then be derived and converted to dollars, from which a percentage figure of the total instructional budget is estimated for each year.

TABLE 5: A Hypothetical Example of Positions Versus Dollars.

FTE Positions

	N	Tenured Faculty	Percent of Total Faculty with Tenure
Professors	25	25	25
Assoc. Professors	25	22	22
Ass't Professors	25	8	8
Instructors	25	0	0
	100	55	55

FTE Dollars

	N	Tenured Dollars	Percent of Dollars For Tenured Faculty
Professors	$550,000	$550,000	33.33
Assoc. Professors	450,000	396,000	24.00
Ass't Professors	375,000	120,000	7.27
Instructors	275,000	-	-
	$1,650,000	$1,066,000	64.60

* * *

Hiring people at a lower rank and/or at a temporary rank would improve the tenure ratio and would allow for a certain staff flexibility; however, the question of dollar flexibility rather than position flexibility may be unwisely ignored under such a procedure. Unless the number of people on tenure or with tenure-like job security is reduced, the institution's dollar flexibility has not improved. Holding constant the level of tenured people while increasing certain nontenured faculty makes an improved ratio but not necessarily an improved dollar situation. For example, consider a reduction in programs cutting into temporary or nontenured personnel only, while leaving tenured staff alone. This is an attractive approach but generally an unrealistic one for long-range planning and management because the long-range dollar flexibility is further impaired. That is why some institutions have chosen to reduce entire programs, thus reducing fixed obligations.

From the hypothetical situation in Table Five, 55 percent of tenured faculty translates into a dollar commitment of 60 to 70 percent of the operating budget. This table indicates that approximately 10 to 15 percent must be added to an institution's tenure personnel percentage figure to obtain actual dollar commitment or the relative amount of inflexible dollars. The question here is at what level would the percentage of positions become dangerously high? The answer, of course, varies according to institution. However, in general, a dangerous level is reached when actual dollars to support committed tenured faculty hinders the institution in coping with the financial constraints spoken of earlier. A maximum level will also depend on salary levels and the total position base for computing tenure. If one included other personnel in the base, such as graduate assistants and assistant instructors, then the dollar factor is enlarged.

Because of factors such as future enrollment levels, state funding levels, degree of legal commitment to university personnel other than faculty, the changing nature of federal support, and external comparative data, one would conclude that for many institutions tenure levels and upper rank percentages are very close to their maximum. Certainly, it seems unwise to allow commitments to grow much beyond current levels if an institution is to be able to handle any unknown future while retaining flexibility and institutional vitality. On the other hand, there is no current evidence available which readily encourages institutions to reduce their pattern of commitments.

References

Blackburn, Robert T. Tenure Aspects of Job Security on the Changing Campus. Research Monograph No. 19. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1972.

"College Enrollment Boom Peters Out." The Ann Arbor News, April 11, 1973.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. Faculty Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

"Coping with Adversity: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1971-72." AAUP Bulletin, 58 (2), (June 1972), pp. 178-243.

Faculty Salaries in Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Circular No. 358, 1951-52.

Furniss, W. Todd. Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems, Current Practice. American Council on Education Special Report, 1972.

_____. Steady-State Staffing in Tenure-Granting Institutions, and Related Papers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

Hopkins, S. P. David. An Early Retirement Program for the Stanford Faculty: Report and Recommendations. Report No. 72-1. Stanford: Office of the Vice President and Provost, Stanford University, 1972.

_____. The Influence of Appointment, Promotion, and Retirement Policies on Faculty Rank Distributions. Report No. 72-2. Stanford: Office of the Vice President and Provost, Stanford University, 1972.

Keast, William R. "The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education: A Preview of the Report." presented at the annual meeting of The Association of American Colleges, San Francisco, January 15, 1973.

Miller, John Perry. "Tenure: Bulwark of Academic Freedom and Brake on Change." Educational Record, 51 (3), 1970, pp. 241-245.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. Accountability in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1972.

"The New Depression in Higher Education-Two Years Later: 'From a State of Steady Erosion to One of Fragile Stability.'" The Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (28), (April 16, 1973), pp. 4-5, quoting Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education: Two Years Later. Carnegie Commission, 1973.

Pfnister, Allan O. "Promotion and Tenure Policies in Undergraduate Colleges." North Central Association Quarterly, XXXII (3), (January 1958), 268-275.

"Retain Tenure But Ration It, Panel Advises." The Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (16), (January 22, 1973), pp. 1, 5.

Roose, Kenneth D., and Andersen, Charles J. A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Salaries Paid and Salary Practices in Universities, Colleges, 1961-62. Higher Education Series, Research Report 1962-R2. Research Division, National Education Association, February, 1962.

Shaw, B. N. Academic Tenure in American Higher Education. Chicago: Adams Press, 1971.

Smith, Bardwell L., and Associates. The Tenure Debate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

"Summary of Tenure Panel's 47 Recommendations." The Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (25), (March 26, 1973), p. 6.

Trow, Martin. "The Distribution of Academic Tenure in American Higher Education." in Smith, Bardwell L., and Associates. The Tenure Debate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.